

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/671,227	09/24/2003	Harri Valio	944-001.010-3 8209			
4955	7590 08/23/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
WARE FRI	ESSOLA VAN DER SL	TRAN, KHANH C				
ADOLPHSO BRADFORD	ON, LLP OGREEN BUILDING 5	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	TREET, P O BOX 224	2631				
MONROE,	CT 06468	DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)	———/I			
		10/671,2	27	VALIO, HARRI				
	Office Action Summary	Examine		Art Unit				
		Khanh Tra	an	2631				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on th	cover sheet with the	correspondence addres	is			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a representation of the provision of	N. 1.136(a). In no every within the stated will apply and witte, cause the appropriate the appropriate in the appropriate.	ent, however, may a reply be tutory minimum of thirty (30) d rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro blication to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this commu IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.			
Status								
1)  🏹	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	September :	2003.					
•	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 25-34 is/are pending in the applicat	tion.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	rawn from co	nsideration.					
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
·	Claim(s) <u>25-34</u> is/are rejected.							
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election r	equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
•	The drawing(s) filed on 09/24/2003 is/are: a)		or b) objected to t	by the Examiner.				
, —	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) l	oe held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is requir	ed if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.	.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. N	ote the attached Offic	ce Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have bee ents have bee riority docume eau (PCT Rul	en received. en received in Applica ents have been recei e 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stag	ge			
Attachmen	• •							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail					
3) 🔯 Infon	the of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/07/2004</u> .	08)		Patent Application (PTO-152	<b>!)</b>			

Art Unit: 2631

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 25, 28, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kohli et al. U.S. Patent 6,393,046.

Regarding claim 25, in column 7, lines 1-45, Kohli et al. invention provides an improved multipath signal processing technique which directly cancels the effect of multipath signals by processing the composite of direct and multipath signals as received to create a synthesized replica of the signal as received which may then be subtracted from the signals as received to cancel or eliminate the effects of the non-direct path, unwanted multipath signals. The foregoing teachings correspond to the claimed "generating a replica code...".

The correlation products are used in a code-tracking loop to track and determine code phase. The most common scheme is to track points of equal magnitude (or power) separated by one C/A code chip width and estimate the time of arrival of the direct path signal as the mid-point between these points of equal magnitude. The points

Art Unit: 2631

of equal magnitude on either side of the direct path arrival time are known as the early and late correlation time and the estimated arrival time of the direct path is called the punctual correlation time

In column 9, lines 15-30, Kohli et al. further teaches that multipath performance is improved by use of tracking means responsive to the matrix means for tracking a prompt delay from a source of the code together with means for monitoring correlation products representing lesser time delays than the prompt delay to detect the inaccurate tracking of a multipath signal from the source of the code. In addition, multipath errors are reduced by analyzing the ratios of correlation products surrounding the prompt correlation to correct for interference using means for causing correlation products of two of the time delayed replicas to be equal together with means for selecting the prompt delay in response to the ratio of the amplitude of the equal correlation products to a correlation product having a time delay therebetween. The prompt time delay is selected to be less than half way between the time delays of the equal correlation products if the ratio of the amplitudes of the equal correlation products to a correlation product having a time delay half way between the time delays of the equal correlation products is greater than one or more than half way between the time delays of the equal correlation products if the ratio of the amplitudes of the equal correlation products to a correlation product having a time delay half way between the time delays of the equal correlation products is less than one.

Art Unit: 2631

Regarding claim 28, claim 28 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 25 because of similar scope.

Regarding claim 31, claim 31 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 25 because of similar scope.

Regarding claim 34, referring to figure 19, the code tracking error 310 includes a numerically controlled oscillator (NCO) for adjusting the timing of the PN generator.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 26-27, 29-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohli et al. U.S. Patent 6,393,046.

Regarding claim 26, Kohli et al. does not teach the claimed limitation "wherein the first delay time is a delay of approximately –0.5 chip from the second delay time".

However, in column 17, lines 15-50, Kohli further discusses conventional GPS receivers maintain a lock on a satellite signal after acquisition by performing additional correlations, often called early and late correlations or correlations performed by early

Art Unit: 2631

and late correlators. These correlations are displaced in time by a certain delay such as one half the width of a C/A code chip from the on-time or prompt correlator. That is, if the time of occurrence of a particular chip in the satellite signals is time t0, the prompt correlator under ideal conditions would multiply satellite signals 72 with a replica of the code with the same chip at time t0. The early correlation would be performed at time t0-1/2 chip and the late correlation would be performed at a time equal to t0+1/2 chip. Whenever the synchronization between code generator 76 and satellite signals 72 as received begins to drift, the correlation results begin to change in favor of either the early or late correlation at the expense of the prompt correlation. Because selecting early correlation and late correlation as close as possible would improve accuracy of estimating the prompt correlation, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, the conventional GPS receivers can be modified so that early correlation is a delay of -0.5 chip from the late correlation. Motivation is to improve accuracy of estimating the prompt correlation.

Regarding claim 27, as recited in claim 26, the early correlation would be performed at time t0-1/2 chip and the late correlation would be performed at a time equal to t0+1/2 chip. In view of that, the late correlation is approximately one chip from the correct timing.

Regarding claim 29, claim 29 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 26 because of similar scope.

Art Unit: 2631

Regarding claim 30, claim 30 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 27 because of similar scope.

Regarding claim 32, claim 32 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 26 because of similar scope.

Regarding claim 33, claim 33 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 27 because of similar scope.

#### Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Abbott et al. U.S. Patent 6,516,021 B1 discloses "Global Positioning Systems And Inertial Measuring Unit Ultra-tight Coupling Method".

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-3007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 08:00 AM - 05:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2631

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**KCT** 

Khanh cong tran 08/19/2005 Examiner KHANH TRAN